

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action of February 12, 2004, in which the Examiner made certain technical objections to the specification and claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 14 as unpatentable over Fig. 12a of Sakurai et al. '544, in view of Sakurai et al.

The Examiner rejected claims 2-3 over Sakurai et al. in view of Laskaris et al. '880 or Miyamoto et al. '966.

The Examiner rejected claims 18-11 over Sakurai in view of Miyamoto.

None of the references cited suggest the constituent features of the amended claim 12 setting forth that "the ratio (Sb/Sa) is at least 80%". This ratio has the effect of reducing the formation of eddy currents, and the feature is not addressed in any of the references including Sakurai, which does not address eddy currents.

Tables 1 and 2 illustrate the advantage of the invention, i.e., the effect of reducing eddy currents. The effect of enhancing the uniformity is illustrated in Table 12. Further, the ratio (Sb/Sa) in the prior art include references to 70-75% more or less (See PCT specification, page 8, lines 11-12), but the claimed ratio has the unanticipated advantage of improved eddy current performance.


Applicants consider that recitation of the ratio (Sb/Sa) as at least 80% or higher is more precise rather than simply setting our the ratio (Sb/Sa) as at least 80%. Accordingly, the claims have been so amended.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider his rejection of the claims, the allowance of which is earnestly solicited.

If the filing of this response requires an additional fee, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account 04-2223 or credit any overpayment thereto.

Respectfully submitted,

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC


John R. DeLuca
Registration No. 25,505

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC
1300 I Street, N.W.
Suite 300 West
Washington, D.C. 20005
202-906-8600

DC01\78617.1
IDVPD